



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

conjunction of manner, as "he grows frantic and beats the air *like* Carlyle." Nothing is said as to the government of the following word, unless we are to infer that the adjective retains the governing power it had in Anglo-Saxon, which is, indeed, the case, and that the conjunction takes the same case after as before it.

Under the adverbial use of the participle, the pupil is cautioned against regarding a participial phrase as necessarily adjectival. Thus in the sentence, "the letter of introduction, *containing no matter of business*, was speedily run through," the clause in italics is adverbial. But does it not qualify *letter*, and must not *containing* be parsed as a participle agreeing with *letter*? We make the sentence "the letter, which contained no matter, etc.," and, though the idea is plainly that the letter was speedily run through *because* it contained no matter of business, *yet* this clause must be analyzed as adjectival. An attributive clause may express relations of cause, time, place, etc.

In the sentence, "he went several times to England, *where he does not seem to have attracted any attention*," are our authors correct in regarding the italicized clause as adverbial? Does it not rather modify *England*, and must it not, therefore, be an adjectival clause, and equal to "in which country, etc.?"

The points of disagreement between the reviewer and his authors are, for the most part, insignificant. In its plan and execution, in its definitions and illustrations, this book fulfills all the requirements of the purpose it is intended to serve, and deserves a most favorable reception from the schools and colleges of this country.

JAS. W. TUPPER.

Philadelphia.

ENGLISH SOUNDS.

Untersuchungen zur Englischen Lautgeschichte, von KARL LUICK: 8vo, pp. xvi, 334. Strassburg: K. J. Trübner, 1896.

MUCH water will flow down the Rhine yet before the completion, humanly speaking, of every chapter of the history of English sounds down to our own day; before the story is told

—one coherent story—of the outer and inner phonetic life of successive or co-existent literary languages and strata, of Old, Middle and Modern English dialects, of the relations of each of these to the rest, and the bearing of all of them on the genesis and growth of modern standard English. Much as has been achieved since Ellis' great work placed the phonological study of English on a scientific basis less than thirty years ago—*E. E. P.*, vols. i, ii, 1869; iii, 1870; iv, 1874; v, 1889—a glance at Sweet and Kluge (*H. E. S.* 1888, *Grdr.* i, 1891) suffices to show how many gaps need to be filled in order to prepare the way for relatively true insight into the factors and processes of sound-change during the whole course, and over the whole area, of English speech.

The modern period especially is still largely unexplored, although, thanks to Ellis, such exploration has become in no small degree either merely a work of corroboration, of correction in details, of extension, or an examination of a vast body of carefully verified evidence. We know most about the one dialect raised by special circumstances above the rest, the language of literature and education; its precise origin, however, the rate and chronology of change, the manner in which it spread over a continuously widening area and attained to supremacy at last, the modifications it underwent in consequence of dialect mixture—these are questions the answers to which can at present be only partial and tentative. Least understood, for reasons not far to seek, is the historical development of the sound-systems of modern dialects. Yet the main key to the problems just mentioned must presumably be sought here, while light on the affiliation of existing varieties of pronunciation with their ME. prototypes would clear up ME. dialectal conditions, make an adequate conception possible of English speech in its unity and diversity, and greatly enrich and deepen our knowledge of linguistic laws in general.

Every student of English phonology will, therefore, heartily welcome Luick's brilliant attempt to treat, from the points of view indicated, a cardinal portion of the vowel-system in dialects still existing in England. Nor is it

too much to say that no one interested in linguistics will read these *Untersuchungen* without being amply and substantially repaid. The book is, indeed, a notable contribution to philological literature, whether we have in mind the kind of sound-phenomena of which it gives the first historico-comparative treatment; or the special solutions of specific problems old and new, together with many new lines of inquiry, as well as points of departure, merely suggested; or the methods and criteria discussed and applied; or the fine example furnished not only of the conduct, but also of the external form of an investigation; or, finally, the wealth of suggestion and stimulation due to Luick's power of both induction and *a priori* construction, conjoined with his deliberate effort to see details in their largest relations in order to push beyond partial results and particular laws to the most general laws and unifying principles.

These researches fall into two groups. The specific aim of the first is to trace—within the limits of the Germanic element—the modern dialectal development of the ME. long vowels <OE. longs, and *a, e, o* in open syllables, together with the closely related history of such ME. diphthongs as *au, ai, ei*, and to ascertain further how far this development will serve to explain extra-dialectal conditions both of earlier periods and of modern literary English. With the results obtained for points of departure, the second set of enquiries supplements the first, dealing as it does with the mooted question of quantitative and qualitative modifications of *i* and *u* in open syllables.

Outside of *i* and *u*, little account is taken of quantity since every living dialect clearly attests the general character of the great OE. and EME. quantitative movements, while subsequent changes, so far as they are traceable at present, are confined to isolated instances and hence do not affect the main course of events. In other respects, too, the boundary lines of the field of search were fixed less by arbitrary selection than by the very complex nature of the facts themselves. As was to be expected, these facts made it impossible to bring to light and explain the quantitative changes of one ME. long vowel without establishing, not merely the absolute value or values of its

modern equivalents in any one dialect, but their relative values as well, that is their position with reference to neighboring sounds in the same sound-system. The study of one one problem, accordingly, necessitated the solution of another until the circle of closely interconnected phenomena was complete. Hence the inclusion of ME. diphthongs, except *eu, eu, oi, ut*, and the exclusion of the Romance element save *ü*. Again, one dialect interprets another. Only the comparative working over of large areas of material can assure safe conclusions. Moreover, several stages of the same process are found to exist side by side in different dialects. The geographical limits of the investigation must, therefore, embrace not one dialect here and another there, but all of them.

In accordance with the comprehensive purpose of the book, and in keeping with the wisely chosen inductive mode of procedure, the treatment of each vowel, or vowel-group, subdivides itself, where practicable, into a series of distinct consecutive steps. The first consists, of course, in the critical sifting of modern equivalents for ME. sounds, and in grouping them according to kind and geographical distribution. Next follows the attempt to discover the course, the causes and the chronology of development. The bearings of the conclusions reached on the pronunciation and the vocabulary of English constitute the object of the third step. The fourth is concerned with backward inferences as to older or general conditions and processes; for example, the rounding of OE. *ā*, the relation between *ē* and *ĕ*, etc. Under the modest heading "Schlussbemerkenngen," these various results are correlated and final far-reaching deductions made.

Such a programme, it is needless to say, if conceived at all, could not have been carried out, even in part, before the appearance of the "Existing Phonology of English Dialects," vol. v of *Early English Pronunciation*. Here are minute analyses, recorded in the same exact symbols, of dialect sounds representing more than eleven hundred places of England and the Lowlands of Scotland, analyses comprising the same classified word lists, which, exclusive of words of Romance origin, contain seven hun-

dred and twelve Germanic words whose OE. or Norse forms are known. The data thus gained are grouped in a way to facilitate further comparison; the areas and lines of demarcation, traced on dialect maps, more than suggest the connection with the ME. distribution. Ellis' work, accordingly, supplies the base of operation, which is strengthened by three special treatises,—Elworthy's "Dialect of West Somerset" (*Trans. Phil. Soc.* 1875-6)—a genuinely Southern type; Murray's "Dialect of the Southern Counties of Scotland" (*Trans. Phil. Soc.* 1870-73)—a genuinely Northern type; and more valuable than either, Joseph Wright's exhaustive and historical *Grammar of the Dialect of Windhill* (*Engl. Dial. Soc.* 67, London 1892)—a representative of the Northwest Midland. On the whole Luick keeps close to Ellis also in the method of presentation. That he does not use "dialectal paleotype," save where a more exact notation is needed than that required by vowel types, can only meet with approval. His departure from Ellis in arranging his material according to ME. instead of OE. values, is abundantly justified by the gain in simplicity and lucidity alone (cf. Luick's remarks *Anglia Beiblatt* iv, p. 162). For the historical reconstruction no important monographs, dissertations, etc., have been neglected. The principal sources, enumerated and critically discussed in the very valuable methodological introductions, are 1. the dialectal writings, of which but few, outside of Scotland, are later than the beginning of the fifteenth century, 2. transcriptions of dialect, in Elizabethan dramas—mostly vague and clumsy hints, 3. the grammarians of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, who directly or indirectly contribute more evidence than has been utilized hitherto, and 4. the analogies afforded by the literary language. The second part (*i*-, *u*-) is largely the outcome of an examination by Luick himself of more than one hundred thousand ME. rimes from the *Cursor Mundi*, and other documents both North- and South-Humbrian.

This brief résumé of available evidence shows how much is left to conjectural reasoning and how many the sources of error. But the latter diminish in number where only the typical features of development are sought,

while the former is rendered less dangerous by the fact that the ME. and Mod. E. termini being given, the connecting links can often be determined by a comparison of dialects and by general phonetic considerations. The chances of achieving something more than an airy network of guesses are reinforced in this case by Luick's comprehensive grasp of details, his mastery of phonetic principles, and his ability to keep all the factors involved present while attending to one. If many essential particulars that went into the making of the table given on p. 310 seem possible rather than probable, and the statement "Ae. *i*- und *u*- wurden im Nordhumbrischen vor dem Ende des 13. Jahrhunderts zu *ē* und *ō* gedehnt" probable rather than certain, future research has been provided, to say the very least, with a thoroughly scientific and systematic account of possible explanations.

Instead of singling out details from a whole whose parts are so firmly knit together, it will be more just to the ultimate aims of the author to give an epitome, in part, of his final syntheses and deductions. The first amounts to a sketch, complete in outline, of the evolution of the modern English vowel-system as a whole.

The organic isolative changes affecting two large ME. groups, one North-Humbrian, the other South-Humbrian, are due in the last analysis to only a few great causative tendencies. They are:

1. The general advance of *ē*, *ō* to *i*, *u*. In consequence the latter are elbowed out of their respective positions and become diphthongs of the *ai* and *au* type, whence probably the monophthonging of the ME. *ai*, *ou*, *au*, while ME. *oi*, *ui*, *eu*, *eu*, remain diphthongs.

2. The general movement of *ā* (*ǣ* participating only to a limited extent) toward the vowel extreme. The direct result is that ME. *ē* is pushed on toward *i* and often reaches this sound, especially where the place of *i* becomes vacant; that is, where *i* < ME. *ē* is diphthonged (for example, 26, 31 on Ellis' map). Where ME. *ē* occupies the vowel extreme, ME. *ē* usually moves into the same position, only in dialects retaining *ā* and *ǣ* as monophthongs or substituting for the former the levelled equivalent of ME. *ai*. ME. *ū*, probably because

symmetrical with respect to $\bar{e}$, falls in with these changes and advances toward $\bar{u}$. But it does not keep pace with $\bar{e}$, presumably because free from being crowded itself. Hence the frequent generation of a new symmetry out of ME. $\bar{a}$ and $\bar{o}$. The first components of diphthongs, it should be added, share the fortunes of corresponding long vowels.

Two other primary tendencies, less general than the foregoing, enter as differentiating factors—"blunting" and "sharpening."

3. "Blunting" (Abstumpfung), that is the diphthonging of the values $\bar{e}$ and $\bar{o}$ by reducing the last half of each to one of the mixed sounds. $\bar{e}$ becomes $e\bar{o}$; $\bar{o}$ becomes $o\bar{o}$. This movement sets in earliest in the North and adjoining parts of the Midland Division, where its results are found as early as the last decades of the sixteenth century. In the South and the East, it belongs to the second quarter of the seventeenth. Here and there it repeats itself. $\bar{o}$ corresponds everywhere to ME. $\bar{o}$; $\bar{e}$ to ME. $\bar{e}$ only in the Midland Division and a small portion of the North. In Southern Scotland, together with the larger part of the North, and in the South and East, it corresponds to ME. $\bar{a}$. Unaffected by the change are the larger part of the Lowlands and many districts in the East. Under the influence of the second great impulse, $e\bar{o}$, $o\bar{o}$, become $e\bar{a}$, $o\bar{a}$, further modified by combinative changes into $i\bar{a}$, $u\bar{a}$ or back to $e\bar{o}$, $o\bar{o}$. One member of the series of monophthongs being removed, ME. $\bar{a}$ or $\bar{e}$ pass on towards the vowel extreme, mostly occupied by ME. $\bar{e}$, without coincidence of any two of these vowels.

4. "Sharpening" (Zuspitzung), that is, the diphthonging of the values $\bar{e}$, $\bar{o}$, by a slight raising of the tongue, with increased rounding for $\bar{o}$. $\bar{e}$ becomes ei ; $\bar{o}$ becomes ou . $\bar{e}$ corresponds throughout to ME. $\bar{e}$; $\bar{o}$ to ME. $\bar{o}$. The change occurs especially in the East and where blunting does not take place. Compared with the latter its area is small and, to judge from standard English, far more recent.

To these four independent impulses it may be necessary to add a fifth—the unrounding of u , unless this proves to be causally connected with the back modification of ME. o , itself perhaps occasioned by the fronting of a .

Combinative influences aside, the great di-

versity of modern products, is chiefly determined 1. by differences in the ME. basis of development, 2. by differences in the points of time at which the same impulse manifests itself, variations in the rate of change and in the time relations of one movement to another, and 3. by the interplay of the tendencies enumerated.

Luick's conspectus of the kinds and stages of vowel change in the dialect of Windhill, in the West Riding of Yorkshire, serves well to illustrate the preceding generalizations so far as they relate to long sounds. ei , oi , ui , however, are not examples of "sharpening," but of special local developments (see Table p. 310).

And what of the relation of English dialects to the history of the literary language? As early as the fourteenth century, writers north of the Humber line begin to avoid rimes peculiar to the vernacular as compared with South-Humbrian speech. They go even a step farther and substitute southern usage, as when OE. i -, u -, (North. $\bar{e}$, $\bar{o}$) are joined with i , u , and $\bar{e}$ is introduced for $\bar{a}$ < OE. $\bar{a}$. *Mutatis mutandis* the same holds true within the South-Humbrian dialect group. A growing sense that another dialect is superior to the native idiom, avoidance of certain peculiarities that come to be looked upon as provincial, and the adoption instead of what is felt to be less rude, as well as more general, these were the initial steps toward a common literary medium.

That the vowel-system of incipient literary English was typically South-Humbrian is, of course, well known; that it belonged to the Southeast Midland, (Ellis' East), is corroborated by the fluctuations between $\bar{e}$ and $\bar{e}$ for OE. $\bar{e}$ < Germ. $\bar{e}$, Goth. $\bar{e}$. Elsewhere the Midland had $\bar{e}$ and the western part of the South $\bar{e}$. Whether and to what extent it shared the characteristics of the eastern part of the South is at present not ascertainable. But clearly North-Humbrian are such forms as beetle, cleepe, evil, gleed, sieve, speir, week, weet, weevil, door, wood, and creek, peel (vb.), sleek, brook (vb.), etc., which probably came in during the fifteenth century.

Within the limits of the specifically modern period of development, the literary language is in substantial agreement with the eastern

dialect group. Neither has "blunting," which process, however, may possibly have had something to do with the introduction of the spelling *ea* and *oa*; both have "sharpening." Common to both and the South is the new symmetry between ME. *ā* and *ȳ*. The conflicting testimony of the earlier grammarians concerning the pronunciation of ME. *ā* and *ai* reflects, not the struggle between the old and the new in the same dialect, but the difference between the more progressive East and South and the more conservative Midland (cf. *Anglia* xiv, 268).

Dialectal influence reveals itself further in a number of more or less isolated elements introduced at various times. In the sixteenth century the region north of the Humber contributes swoon, woo, wee, probably also roe, <*hroga*, and diphthongal *ei* in either. In the second half of the seventeenth century the *ȳ* sound of broad, groat, bought, brought, etc., enters from the western part of the South; the same is true of *uv* in one, once. Key with the sound corresponding to ME *ē* belongs to the West Midland. The *ē* in break, great, steak, yea, which first shows itself in the first half of the eighteenth century, probably comes from the Southwest. To this list must be added the North-Humbrian sixteenth and seventeenth century variants with *ē*, *ō* for OE. *i*-, *u*-, in such words as above, love, some, come, son, etc.

Enough has been said to show the importance of this work to the student of Modern and Middle English Phonology. To the student of sound change in general, Luick's penetrating analyses of the relations between single sounds as such and of causal connections between their apparently spontaneous changes, will be especially welcome. His explanations of the displacement of one sound by another, and of the tendency toward symmetry, constitute a valuable addition to the body of general principles as formulated by Paul and Sweet. And whether or not future labors in the same field will lead to the conviction that we know less than we thought we did, it will hardly be wholly premature for us--

"uns an der Einfachheit und Durchsichtigkeit der Zusammenhänge zu erfreuen, mit einer Art ästhetischen Wolgefallens die saubere

Abgrenzung des ungestörten Lautwandels zu verfolgen und die strenge Gesetzmässigkeit, der sich die Einzelfälle unterordnen, hier ebenso zu bewundern wie sonst im Wirken der Natur" (p. 322).

ALEXIS F. LANGE.

University of California.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE 'WALPURGISNACHT.'

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—In the March number of the NOTES Mr. Clyde B. Furst tries his hand upon the "heillose Verwirrung," as Erich Schmidt calls it, which is presented by the chronology of the love-tragedy in *Faust*. I have read in a teachable mood the passages in which he pays his respects to me, but I am unable to see that he has really squared the circle. What he does is to offer an explanation which would be very good indeed, and very obvious withal,—if only there were nothing to explain. In other words he dodges the central crux of the whole matter,—the *übermorgen* of l. 3662. He thinks it "not inconceivable that the word may have an indefinite future meaning," although he has been "unable to find any other instances of such use." Probably he will continue unable to find them, but even if he should meet with better success than I anticipate, the proposed interpretation would have to be ruled out of court in view of the preceding words of Mephistopheles:

So spukt mir schon durch alle Glieder
Die herrliche Walpurgisnacht.

These lines point clearly to a Walpurgis-Night which is just ahead,—near enough to account for Mephisto's 'Rammelei.' Or would Mr. Furst teach that the devil feels the electric thrill of the great festival several months in advance?

It is then a fixed datum, if anything in *Faust* can be fixed by words, that the Valentin-scene takes place just before the Walpurgis-Night. Now suppose we adopt Mr. Furst's supposition, which is one that has probably occurred to every careful reader of the poem, and was thoroughly pondered by me when I was writing my Introduction; the supposition, namely, that the Walpurgis-Night is that of the year